



City of Loma Linda Official Report

Floyd Petersen, Mayor
Stan Brauer, Mayor pro tempore
Robert Christman, Councilmember
Robert Ziprick, Councilmember
Charles Umeda, Councilmember

COUNCIL AGENDA: June 14, 2005
TO: City Council
VIA: Dennis R. Halloway, City Manager
FROM: Pamela Byrnes-O'Camb, City Clerk *pbo*
SUBJECT: Minutes of April 26; May 3, 10 and 17, 2005

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council approve the Minutes of April 26; May 3, 10 and 17, 2005.

City of Loma Linda

City Council Minutes

Regular Meeting of April 26, 2005

A regular meeting of the City Council was called to order by Mayor pro tempore Petersen at 7:06 p.m., Tuesday, April 26, 2005 in the Council Chamber, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Councilmen Present:	Mayor pro tempore Floyd Petersen Robert Christman Stan Brauer Robert Ziprick
---------------------	---

Councilman Absent:	None
--------------------	------

Others Present:	City Manager Dennis Halloway City Attorney Richard E. Holdaway
-----------------	---

The invocation and Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mayor pro tempore Petersen. No items were added or deleted and no conflicts of interest were noted.

Oral Reports/Public Participation

Cindy Chrisler, 25446 Lane Street, addressed the City Council relating to Tentative Tract 15738, stating that the Planning Commission, the Developer, and the residents of the North Central Neighborhood came to a consensus on the number of homes, the layout, the joining of State Street with Lane Street, and terminating Lilac Street in a cul-de-sac. She supported the plan as now proposed. She questioned the influence staff may have on the revised plan that was approved by the Planning Commission and which would be considered by the City Council in May.

* * * * *

Mayor Petersen announced that the applicant for the California Heart and Surgical Hospital, scheduled for the May 10 meeting, withdrew the application; therefore, the item would not be heard on May 10.

Scheduled and Related Items

CC-2005-047 – Workshop/Public Hearing – General Plan Update Project – Land Use Element (2.0)

The public hearing was opened. Director of Community Development Woldruff stated that the changes made by the Planning Commission and individual requests received over the past two years were contained in the agenda packet. She then recommended that the presentations be made; testimony be taken; and that the item be continued to allow more time for citizens and City Council to study the document. She then introduced Lloyd Zola, consultant to the City for the General Plan Update.

Mr. Zola stated that the Land Use Element was the key Element to the General Plan because the other elements lead to the Land Use Element. He explained that the basic requirements of the Land Use Element are that the Element identifies the appropriate uses of land throughout the General Plan Study Area, the appropriate density or intensity of use; and the rules for development as well as open space so both could occur. The Land Use Element of the General Plan eventually would be translated into the Zoning Ordinance. The General Plan would contain policy statements relating to land use, the manner of development, style of development, and specific standards, which would then be placed in the Zoning Ordinance to implement the General Plan.

The basics of the latest version of the Land Use Element have been available since October 2004. Two newer portions of the Land Use Element were the Hillside Designation and the Special Planning Areas. As a result of the Planning Commission's recommendation regarding the Hillside Designation, a new land use category of "very low density" was added that would allow a density of up to two units per acre. The Very Low Density category would be applied to the bench area at the base of the South Hills in the eastern portion of the City; the grove area and the area south of Beaumont Avenue up to the toe of the slope. The concept in that area is that the Very Low Density area be defined as a suburban enclave, that lot sizes be larger than what is typical in a suburban subdivision, and that amenities such as trails be integrated into the area.

The Open Space category was also added to the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The Planning Commission recommended that the public lands in the South Hills, Hulda Crooks Park, and the land adjacent to the park, be designated as open space and retained in long-term public open space. The General Plan category for public open space was defined as intended for the preservation of natural area,

as an area where buildings and facilities would generally be prohibited, except those that were necessary for the enjoyment of the natural open space, such as trails or, trail head facilities. However, even those facilities need to be consistent and compatible with the environmental character of the area. Therefore, in designing trails, consistency and compatibility with the resources that the trails traverse would be required.

Mr. Zola went on to say that the Hillside designation was the most controversial and debated portion of the General Plan because of the clash of values and clash of rights. On the one hand there exists a passion in the community to preserve and protect natural open space in the South Hills. On the other hand, a large portion of the land in the South Hills is privately owned with inherent rights. The debate has related to the question of how to balance the right of the private property owners and the community's desire to preserve the South Hills and the open space. The recommendation presented attempts to balance those rights and desires.

He noted that the City Council appointed a committee to recommend trails, open space, and targeted areas for acquisition of open space in the South Hills. The Planning Commission recommended that the target areas for acquisition of open space be incorporated into the General Plan as areas that the City would desire to retain in open space, or would like to acquire as permanent natural open space. At the same time, the proposed General Plan explicitly recognizes that in many of those areas, there is private ownership and there are development rights underlying that area. It is proposed that there be low densities in the hillside areas paralleling a program wherein the City would attempt to acquire land for permanent open space.

Mr. Zola continued that within the Initiative Area, the General Plan recognized a density of one unit per 10 acres within non-clustered subdivisions and in clustered subdivisions, one unit per five acres. The concept of clustered development is that the same number of units would occur on a smaller land area with the balance of that area being retained in open space. He noted that the same concept was behind the Hillside Designation, both within the Initiative Area to encourage clustering as well as within hillside areas outside of the Initiative.

The recommendation of the Planning Commission for areas outside of the Initiative was one (1) dwelling unit per five (5) acres in non-clustered subdivisions and one (1) dwelling unit per two (2) acres in clustered subdivisions, which allowed recognition of the Initiative Area while allowing for a slightly higher density for development within areas not included in the Initiative.

He then addressed provisions of the Hillside Area for the ultimate implementation of the General Plan, one being protection of the land and development along Pilgrim Lane, which now has large rural lots. The proposed General Plan spoke to preserving those lots in that density, allowing the continuance of commercial animal keeping in that area, designating areas for development of surrounding lands, providing buffers adjacent to the existing uses on Pilgrim Lane; and requiring setbacks from the ridges that would be identified, mapped, and returned for review of the entire General Plan.

Another provision of the Hillside Area addressed securing open space under public ownership as permanent open space in the Hillside Area, noting that a clustered development would accomplish that. The proposed General Plan also provided an incentive to not only cluster development, but also to ensure that development within the areas targeted for open space was clustered to areas outside or to allow for transfers of density from areas that the City would target for open space acquisition to areas that weren't targeted. The incentive involved a transfer density out of the areas targeted for acquisition of open space at a rate of 1-1/4 units being transferred for each unit that would have been permitted in that targeted open space area. He confirmed that the implementation of transfers would require an implementing ordinance to ensure that the open space dedicated remained open space permanently and to provide an accounting of the units being transferred.

Mr. Zola responded to questions, stating that the General Plan would contain a policy to allow the possibility for the transfer of density that would then be followed up with an ordinance implementing that policy. Another option would exclude the policy from the General Plan, but allow inclusion of density transfers in the implementation document and the Zoning Ordinance.

Discussion ensued. Mayor Petersen recommended that specific areas of the Land Use Element be considered.

City Attorney Holdaway noted that in the past, there were potential conflicts of interest declared regarding property related to the University or Medical Center. Regarding the General Plan as it affects the entire City, potentially any individual or their source of income may be affected. If a specific change in the General Plan affected a property owned by a source of income, a potential conflict of interest would occur. Therefore, it may be appropriate to separate those areas that may pose a potential conflict of

interest for separate consideration with the Council considering the remainder and the Rule of Necessity being applied to the areas of conflict of interest if necessary.

Director of Community Development Woldruff presented land use requests from property owners as follows:

1) Douglas F. Welebir, Property Owner, requested that his land be excluded from the Hillside designation because the 1996 amendment to the Hillside Initiative Area removed the property from the Initiative area. The majority of the land was flat. The Planning Commission concurred.

2) Ted S. Miller, Property Owner, asked that his property on the north side of Barton Road, west of University Avenue be designated High Density Residential (13.1 to 20 dwelling units per acre). The Planning Commission concurred and a policy was added to the High Density Residential Designation.

3) The Redevelopment Agency asked that the Medium Density Residential Designation be changed to the High Density Residential Designation for the property owned by the Agency located on the east and west sides of Poplar Street between the San Timoteo Creek Channel and north of Van Leuven Street in the North Central Neighborhood to assist in its affordable housing efforts and to address the affordable housing shortage and deficit.

4) Robert Frost, Director of Loma Linda University Foundation, asked that certain aspects of Special Planning Areas B and C be reconsidered regarding restricting the Anderson Street frontage to commercial retail uses and specifying that a future parking structure be placed west of the existing Ritchie Circle. Suggestion was made that commercial retail opportunities be integrated throughout Planning Area B and a parking structure be placed where it was most needed. The Planning Commission concurred.

Mr. Zola summarized the Special Planning Areas, noting that Figure 2.2 should refer to Special Planning Area Boundaries rather than Mixed Use Areas. The Planning Commission recommended that more detail, design, and planning work be done as part of individual development for the Special Planning Areas because the areas encompassed a unique set of circumstances or because conversion of land from one use to another was proposed.

He reviewed Special Planning Area A, west of Loma Linda Academy, noting that the concept was that with the proposed Evans Street alignment, the area should be employment generating or educational oriented in nature, compatible with the Academy.

The concept for Area B, easterly of Anderson Street, was a walkable mixed use community with higher intensity than presently in order to accomplish a better flow of traffic and access onto Tippecanoe and locate the park in the center of the neighborhood that would include office and commercial uses.

The area south of the Campus Hill Church, labeled Area C, was proposed for a traditional small town downtown with small shops and residential above the shops in addition to higher density uses in relation to the University. Housing would be provided for students and faculty, who could walk to work and classes and commercial uses. Also allowed were one or more parking structures so that parking could be provided for future uses off site.

Area D, located west of California Street and north of Mission Road, posed concern relating to density and intensity of use along Mission Road, and maintaining a rural character. The Planning Commission's preference was to minimize or eliminate a medium density development and allow a more traditional sized, suburban development along with trails and having high density in locations adjacent to commercial uses.

Addressing areas to the east of Area D, Areas J, G, and H, the Planning Commission preferred to eliminate a substantial amount of new multi-family development, so the basic concept of the area in the eastern portion of the City (Areas D, E, J, H, and F) was to maintain commercial, office and business park uses along the primary roadways of California Street and Redlands Boulevard and residential toward the interior, permitting only residential uses along those frontages where there was no viable alternative other than residential uses. Within Areas G and J, to focus on commercial and business park in nature rather than large scale multi-family developments.

Area I, centered on the four corners of Barton Road and Mountain View Avenue, was intended to be a higher intensity, city center type of development with a mix of commercial, offices, multi-family development, with higher intensity uses permitted than in other areas – a walkable area.

Director of Community Development Woldruff stated that there were a number of economic and fiscal analyses attached to the staff reports. She noted that the studies showed that California Street, which had been held as the last commercial corridor for the development of revenue generating uses, was not feasible because of the lack of residential to support that type of commercial; therefore, the Special Planning Areas were created to allow flexibility.

Extensive discussion ensued. Councilman Christman expressed concern relating to high density residential south of Barton Road.

Those offering testimony were: John Shumway, 130 Newport Center Drive, Newport Beach and principal with the Concorde Group; Terry Smith, 18627 Brookhurst St., Fountain Valley; Ruthann Lehrer, 2730 Washington Avenue, Santa Monica; Roger Peter Porter, 3837 E. 7th Street, Long Beach; Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road; Milford Harrison; Robert Coronado, 1444 Michigan Avenue; Hugo Chinchay, 26382 Antonio Circle; Ed McCoy, 5510 Morehouse Drive, San Diego; Paul Hsu, 20151 Sealpoint Lane, Huntington Beach; Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue; John Mirau, 1806 Orange Tree Lane, Redlands; Michael Christianson, 25241 Cottage Street; Glenn Elssmann, 25814 Business Center Drive; Charlotte Wacker, 11804 Mountain View Avenue; Robert Frost, LLU Foundation..

Comments are summarized as follows:

- 1) The designation of office for the property at the southwest corner of Orange and New Jersey (Area G) was not viable because of a lack of visibility, the major area corridor being Barton and California; it lies behind the apartments under construction; there was no land use of a commercial nature (critical mass); surrounding land uses, as its neighbor was a church; the main traffic corridor was California and Barton; and New Jersey and Barton was a minor collector.
- 2) Supported retention of Mixed Use Designation for Area G in that the area is currently made up of mixed uses, with residential on approximately 2.7 acres.
- 3) Supported Staff recommendation for Area G bounded by California, Orange, New Jersey, and Barton Road, to be designated as a Special Planning Area.
- 4) The area of Orange and New Jersey lies within the Mission Overlay Zone which uses must be consistent with a Mixed Use General Plan Land Use Designation and Planned Community Zoning, of which high density residential is a permitted use.
- 5) New Jersey Street is a neighborhood serving local street.
- 6) There was a need for work force housing.
- 7) Impacts were substantially greater for commercial development compared to residential development.
- 8) The Welebir property of approximately 42 acres is steep with large landslides and a ridge higher than the ridge on Lawton Avenue, and should be included in the Hillside Designation.
- 9) Clustering and density transfers will promote preservation of open space.
- 10) The southwest corner of Citrus and California Street should be included in a Special Planning Area.
- 11) Mixed Use designation not only affords the City an opportunity to adjust to economic situations, but also the property owner.
- 12) The area near the Filipino SDA Church, Area G, should be designated residential for continuity of uses.
- 13) Area J, east of California Street, should be designated Mixed Use to provide flexibility for the property owners.
- 14) A portion of Area J is in the process of annexation to the City of Loma Linda, and a Mixed Use Designation would be appropriate.
- 15) The plans proposed for the area of Redlands Boulevard, California Street and Mission Road were inconsistent with the General Plan in their current form.
- 16) The City purchased land in the South Hills to control its use.
- 17) Definition of Access to the South Hills was needed.
- 18) The maximum number of houses in the South Hills, including density transfers, was needed.
- 19) Control of open space uses was necessary not only to protect the open space, but those who lived in the near vicinity.
- 20) Increase in density for affordable housing was a concern.

No other public testimony was offered and the public hearing was closed. Extensive discussion ensued, including discussion concerning another meeting date to continue discussion of the Land use Element of the General Plan.

By common consent, the item was continued to Tuesday, May 17 at 6:00 p.m.

CC-2005-048 – Consent Calendar

Motion by Christman, seconded by Ziprick and unanimously carried to approve the Demands Register dated April 26, 2005 with commercial demands totaling \$960,231.38 and payroll demands totaling \$823.32.

CC-2005-049 – Installation of the traffic signal at Redland Boulevard and Richardson Street

Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Christman and unanimously carried to reject all bids for the Traffic Signal at Redlands Boulevard and Richardson Street and direct staff to re-bid the project.

Reports of Councilmen

Councilman Brauer expressed concern over the disappearance of the orange groves and suggested some of the groves be preserved.

Mayor pro tempore Petersen reported that police were testing a device that scanned license plates as the officers were driving to identify stolen vehicles.

Councilman Christman asked staff to look into better methods of securing Hulda Crooks Park and suggested the item be referred to the Parks Committee for recommendation.

The meeting adjourned at 10:36 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 3 for the purpose of interviewing applicants to fill the City Council vacancy.

Approved at the meeting of

City Clerk

City of Loma Linda

City Council Minutes

Adjourned Regular Meeting of May 3, 2005

An adjourned regular meeting of the City Council was called to order by Mayor pro tempore Petersen at 6:08 p.m., Tuesday, May 3, 2005 in the Council Chamber, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Councilmen Present:

Mayor pro tempore Floyd Petersen
Robert Christman
Stan Brauer
Robert Ziprick

Councilman Absent:

None

Others Present:

City Manager Dennis Halloway
City Attorney Richard E. Holdaway

No items were added or deleted, no public participation comments were offered upon invitation of the Chair, and no conflicts of interest were noted.

CC-2005-050 – City Council Vacancy

- a. Interview applicants
- b. Appointment of Council Member to serve pending special election to fill vacancy

Each applicant was called individually to the Council Chamber. The City Council interviewed applicants David Varnam, Charles Umeda, Betty Stark and Thomas Hibbard individually for approximately one-half hour each. At the conclusion of each interview, the applicant left the Council Chamber. At the conclusion of the interviews, City Council discussed the talents and expertise of each, taking into consideration that the term of the office to be filled was approximately one year as well as the topics before the City Council, particularly the General Plan Update.

Motion by Brauer, seconded by Ziprick and unanimously carried to appoint Charles Umeda to fill the vacancy, pending the special election scheduled for June 2006 to fill the vacancy.

The applicants were asked to return to the Council Chamber, and Mayor pro tempore Petersen announced that the City Council appointed Charles Umeda. Mr. Umeda thanked the City Council and commented briefly.

It was noted that Mr. Umeda would be sworn in and seated at the May 10 City Council meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Approved at the meeting of

City Clerk

Regular Meeting of May 10, 2005

A regular meeting of the City Council was called to order by Mayor pro tempore Petersen at 6:25 p.m., Tuesday, May 10, 2005 in the Council Chamber, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Councilmen Present:

Mayor Floyd Petersen
Mayor pro tempore Stan Brauer
Robert Christman
Robert Ziprick
Charles Umeda

Councilman Absent:

None

Others Present:

City Manager Dennis Halloway
City Attorney Richard E. Holdaway

CC-2005-051 – Closed Session – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation (Government Code Section 54956.9(a) Noel Christensen and Citizens Alliance of Loma Linda (“CALL”) vs City and City Council, Case No. SCVSS 1069890

The City Council immediately recessed to consider the closed session item as listed and reconvened at 7:02 p.m. with all members present. City Attorney Holdaway announced that the City Council met with Legal Counsel and gave direction, including authority to proceed with an appeal or other action as may be necessary and to obtain other legal counsel as may be necessary.

The invocation and Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilman Ziprick. No items were added or deleted; no public participation comments were offered upon invitation of the Chair, and no conflicts of interest were noted.

Scheduled and Related Items

CC-2005-052 – Swearing in and seating of Council Member

The City Clerk administered the Oath of Allegiance to Charles Umeda and presented him with a Certificate of Appointment as Member of the City Council. Councilman Umeda took his seat at the dais, thanked the City Council for their confidence in him; introduced John Umeda, his father; Sheila, his wife; and Charles Justin, his son. He extended thanks to former Mayor Gaio Hansberger for her service to the community, her leadership, and accomplishments in the five years she served as a Member of the City Council.

CC-2005-053 – Re-organization of Council, appointments and assignments

- a. Selection of Mayor
- b. Selection of Mayor pro tempore
- c. San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG)
- d. Omnitrans
- e. Inland Valley Development Agency (IVDA)
- f. San Bernardino International Airport Authority (SBIAA)
- g. Solid Waste Management Board
- h. San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District Advisory Commission on Water Policy
- i. California Joint Powers Insurance Authority Board of Directors (CJPIA)
- j. Board of Directors Confire JPA
- k. Zone 3 Flood Control (Mayor)

The City Clerk conducted the selection of Mayor. Councilman Petersen was nominated.

Motion by Christman, seconded by Ziprick and unanimously carried to close nominations and cast a unanimous ballot for Councilman Petersen as Mayor.

Mayor Petersen then conducted the selection of Mayor pro tempore. Councilman Brauer was nominated.

Motion by Christman, seconded by Ziprick and unanimously carried to close nominations and cast a unanimous ballot for Councilman Brauer as Mayor pro tempore.

Appointments to various boards, commissions and committees were discussed with the following results:

San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) - Councilmen Christman and Petersen retained the positions of Delegate and Alternate, respectively;

Omnitrans - Councilmen Petersen and Christman retained the positions of Delegate and Alternate, respectively;

Inland Valley Development Agency (IVDA) - Councilman Christman retained the position of Delegate; Councilman Umeda was appointed Delegate to the vacant seat; and Councilman Petersen retained the position of Alternate;

San Bernardino International Airport Authority (SBIAA) - Councilman Christman retained the position of Delegate; Councilman Umeda was appointed Alternate to fill the vacancy;

Solid Waste Management Board - Councilmen Petersen and Brauer retained their positions as Delegate and Alternate, respectively;

San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District Advisory Commission on Water Policy - Councilmen Brauer and Petersen retained their positions as Delegate and Alternate, respectively;

California Joint Powers Insurance Authority Board of Directors (CJPIA) - Councilman Brauer retained the position of Delegate;

Board of Directors Confire JPA - Councilman Umeda was appointed Delegate; Councilman Petersen retained the position of Alternate;

Zone 3 Flood Control (Mayor) - The Mayor holds the Delegate position; Councilman Ziprick retained the Alternate position.

CC-2005-054 - Proclamation - Blue Ribbon Week - the week of May 15, 2005 in recognition and support of all peace officers and law enforcement agencies

Mayor Petersen summarized the proclamation and the purpose of Blue Ribbon Week as a show of confidence from the general public to all peace officers and law enforcement agencies for the protection of persons, properties, and communities, and presented the proclamation to Lt. Guerra of the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department.

CC-2005-055 - Proclamation - March of Dimes "WalkAmerica" Day, May 15, 2005

Mayor Petersen stated that the March of Dimes was a national, non-profit organization whose mission was to save babies from birth defects, low-birth weight and infant death, and encouraged support of the organizations efforts. He indicated the proclamation would be forwarded to local representatives.

* * * * *

Mayor Petersen announced that Congress passed a measure that allowed cities to proclaim quiet zones for railroads if certain safety precautions were implemented, and added that staff was already working on two level crossings in Loma Linda so that quiet zones could be declared.

CC-2005-056 - Council Bill #R-2005-17 - Ordering the formation of the Underground Utility District

The public hearing was opened and Public Works Director Thaipejr presented his report into evidence, stating that the overhead utilities on Redlands Boulevard would be placed underground from the east to the west City Limits; that Southern California Edison Company cooperated with the City to establish the Underground Utility District. He explained that in August 2004, procedures were established for the formation of the District; funding for the project would encumber the City's Rule 20A funds through the year 2010; thus there would be no cost to the customer. The first phase of the project would extend from Anderson Street to Mountain View Avenue, with the exception of the transmission line along the south side of Redlands Boulevard, which was cost prohibitive to underground at this time.

No other public testimony was offered and the public hearing was closed.

Motion by Christman, seconded by Ziprick and unanimously carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2005-17.

Resolution No. 2383

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, California approving the final Engineer's Report for Loma Linda Underground Utility District No. 2004-01 Redlands Boulevard, and confirming the contractual assessments

CC-2005-057 – Public Hearing – Council Bill #R-2005-21 – Ordering Annexation 66 to Landscape Maintenance District No. 1 for Tract 16650 located at Bryn Mawr and George Streets

The Public Hearing was opened. The City Clerk opened the Petition, which was signed by the property owner and notarized, and the Assessment Ballot that was also signed, approving the proposed landscape maintenance assessment of \$18,684 for the total lots for fiscal year 2005/2006.

No other public testimony was offered and the public hearing was closed.

Motion by Brauer, seconded by Umeda and unanimously carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2005-21.

Resolution No. 2384

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda ordering the levy and collection of assessments for fiscal year 2005/2006 within Landscape Maintenance District No. 1, Annexation No. 66, Tract No. 16650, and confirming the Engineer's Report pursuant to the Landscape and Lighting Act of 1972

CC-2005-058 – Public Hearing – Precise Plan of Design (PPD) No. 04-13 (California Heart & Surgical Hospital – A request to construct a 70,000 square-foot surgical hospital and 25,000 square-foot medical building with the associated amenities including the Zanja Trail, landscaping, and site design. The site is located at the northeast corner of Barton Road and New Jersey Street in the Professional Office General Plan land use designation and the Administrative Professional Office (AP) Zone (Continued from January 25) (WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT)

Mayor Petersen noted that the applicant had withdrawn the application. City Attorney Holdaway stated that the action of the applicant to withdraw the matter effectively removed it from consideration. No action was required.

CC-2005-059 – Consent Calendar

Motion by Christman, seconded by Brauer and unanimously carried to approve the following items:

The Demands Register dated April 30, 2005 with commercial demands totaling \$63,790.86.

The Demands Register dated April 30, 2005 with commercial demands totaling \$61,006.60.

The Demands Register dated April 30, 2005 with commercial demands totaling \$533,510.90 and payroll demands totaling \$184,163.37.

The Demands Register dated May 10, 2005 with commercial demands totaling \$753,366.87 and payroll demands totaling \$199,479.01.

The Minutes of March 8, 22 and 29, 2005 s presented.

The April 2005 Treasurer's Report for filing.

The April 2005 Department of Public Safety Stats Report for filing.

Council Bill #R-2005-24.

Resolution No. 2385

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, California, authorizing the Mayor or Mayor pro tempore to execute for and on behalf of the City an agreement between the Union Pacific Railroad and the City of Loma Linda

Council Bill #R-2005-20.

Resolution No. 2386

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, California, approving the destruction of City records during fiscal year 2004-2005

Council Bill #R-2005-22.

Resolution No. 2387

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, County of San Bernardino, California, initiating proceedings for the annexation of territory to the Loma Linda Landscape Maintenance District No. 1 as Annexation No. 68, Tract No. 16323, determining that these proceedings shall be taken pursuant to the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 and the Right to Vote on Taxes Act, preliminarily approving the Engineer's Report, and declaring the City's intention to order the annexation, and offering a time and place for hearing objections thereto

Certificate of appropriateness for Small Project Application 05-02 relating to a remodel, interior renovation and minor exterior modification to a single-family residence of Craftsman-style architecture constructed in the 1920's and located at 25949 Mission Road.

Council Bill #R-2005-25, 26, and 27 relating to Landscape Maintenance District No. 1 Annual Report for fiscal year 2005-2006.

Resolution No. 2388

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, County of San Bernardino, California, ordering the preparation of an Engineer's Report from Landscape Maintenance District No. 1 for fiscal year 2005/2006

Resolution No. 2389

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, County of San Bernardino, preliminarily approving Engineer's Report for fiscal year 2005/2006 for Landscape Maintenance District No. 1

Resolution No. 2390

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, County of San Bernardino, California, declaring its intention to levy and collect assessments for fiscal year 2005/2006 in Landscape Maintenance District No. 1, an assessment district; declaring the work to be of more special than general public benefit; specifying the exterior boundaries of the areas within Landscape Maintenance District No. 1 to be assessed the cost and expense thereof; designating said District as Landscape Maintenance District No. 1, determining that these proceedings shall be taken pursuant to the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972; and offering a time and place for hearing objections thereto

Council Bill #R-2005-28, 29 and 30 relating to Street Light Benefit Assessment District No. 1 annual Report for fiscal year 2005-2006.

Resolution No. 2391

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, County of San Bernardino, State of California, initiating proceedings and ordering the preparation of an Engineer's Report for Street Light Benefit Assessment District No. 1 for fiscal year 2005/2006

Resolution No. 2392

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, County of San Bernardino, State of California, preliminarily approving Engineer's Report for fiscal year 2005/2006 for Street Light Benefit Assessment District No. 1

Resolution No. 2393

A Resolution of the City council of the City of Loma Linda, County of San Bernardino, California, declaring its intention to levy and collect assessments for fiscal year 2005/2006 in Street Light Benefit Assessment District No. 1 and assessment district; declaring the work to be of more special than general public benefit; specifying the exterior boundaries of the areas within Street Light Benefit Assessment District No. 1 and to be assessed the cost and expense

thereof, designating said District as Street Light Benefit Assessment District No. 1, determining that these proceedings shall be taken pursuant to the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972; and offering a time and place for hearing objections thereto

Council Bill #R-2005-31.

Resolution No. 2394

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, California approving a loan from the Special Projects Fund to the Loma Linda Connected Communities Program in the amount of \$1,593,000

New Business

CC-2005-060 – Declare vacancy on the Planning Commission and direct the Clerk to post a Special Vacancy Notice

Mayor Petersen asked about a procedure similar to that followed for the appointment to the City Council to fill a vacancy. Councilman Umeda noted that membership on the Planning Commission was a very important position and with the issues facing the City, it was important that the position be filled by a qualified individual. He suggested that an application with a series of questions similar to that for appointment of the City Council be considered. Councilman Ziprick concurred. Discussion ensued.

Motion by Christman, seconded by Ziprick and unanimously carried to declare a vacancy on the Planning Commission and direct the Clerk to notice the vacancy and to prepare an application with planning-related questions.

CC-2005-061 – Schedule a meeting to discuss land use in the South Hills as part of the General Plan Update

By common consent, the meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, June 7 at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

Reports of Councilmen

Mayor Petersen asked about the projected date for completion of the bridge at Beaumont Avenue. Director of Public Works Thaipejr stated that San Bernardino County Flood Control managed the project. The plans were submitted to Caltrans for approval because the federal government funded a portion of the project. Caltrans rejected the plans because only one lane in each direction was shown and so the County was in the process of redesigning the bridge and updating the environmental study. He noted that the sidewalk on the north side of the bridge was eliminated and that he would contact the County regarding design of the bridge and approach so that a quiet zone could be declared at the railroad tracks and so that accommodation could be made to extend fiber for the Connected Community Program.

Mr. Thaipejr, in response to questions, stated that the agreement with the UPRR for the widening of the Mountain View Avenue Overpass was approved this evening, to be accompanied by a payment to the Railroad of \$13,000 for the permit. Noise and pollution studies were also required and Southern California Edison needed to relocate power poles. County Flood Control had already issued a permit for the widening.

Councilman Christman reported that 80 percent of the voters of San Bernardino County had voted to extend the Measure I Program. The Sierra Club filed a lawsuit to stop it and a judge allowed the lawsuit to proceed because there was insufficient planning as to location of roadways. Expenditure of funds for planning was not feasible without knowing whether the measure would pass.

The meeting adjourned at 7:53 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 17 for the purpose of discussing the Land Use Element of the proposed General Plan Update.

Approved at the meeting of

City Clerk

City of Loma Linda
City Council Minutes

PENDING CITY
COUNCIL APPROVAL

Adjourned Regular Meeting of May 17, 2005

An adjourned regular meeting of the City Council was called to order by Mayor Petersen at 6:20 p.m., Tuesday, May 17, 2005 in the Council Chamber, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Councilmen Present:	Mayor Floyd Petersen Mayor pro tempore Stan Brauer Robert Christman Robert Ziprick Charles Umeda
Councilman Absent:	None
Others Present:	City Manager Dennis Halloway City Attorney Richard E. Holdaway

No items were added or deleted, no public participation comments were offered upon invitation of the Mayor, and no conflicts of interest were noted.

Scheduled Items

CC-2005-062 – Proclamation – EMS (Emergency Medical Services) Week – May 15-21, 2005

Mayor Petersen read the proclamation and presented it to Director of Public Safety Norris.

CC-2005-063 – Public Hearing/Workshop – Land Use Element (excluding the Hillside Designation) of the Draft General Plan

Mayor Petersen noted that the Land Use Element, excluding the special planning areas, would be discussed first because Council Members had potential conflicts of interest relating to some of the special planning areas.

The public hearing was opened. Director of Community Development Woldruff introduced the item, stating that new text and revised maps were distributed relating to the special planning areas.

Lloyd Zola of LSA Associates, General Plan Consultant, explained that the Land Use Element, other than the special planning areas and the hillsides, generally involved existing development, with a few exceptions, such as the area south of the Civic Center and other high-density areas along Barton Road. He went on to say that the Land Use Element provided rules for development, identified land uses involving residential, commercial, business park, and University development. One of the major changes in the Plan was to identify institutional and health care uses as categories.

The map displayed identified the Planning Commission's recommendations. An area of issue was located on the north side of Barton Road at the west end of the City, which had been shown as office use as part of the General Plan. The Planning Commission identified that area as High Density, the concept being that the High Density Designation would allow for combining driveways easier than the Office Use Designation would. Another area now designated Low Density Residential was located south of Barton Road and straddled the San Jacinto Fault. The landowner requested a Low Density Residential Designation and the Planning Commission concurred. Testimony had been received that suggested the area be designated "Hillside."

Director of Community Development Woldruff elaborated that the subject area was removed from the Initiative Area by the Amendment to the Initiative and as a result, it was not designated "Hillside." The prominent ridge was surrounded by development and so the subject site was already in an urbanized area.

Mr. Zola pointed out an area on the west side of Mt. View Avenue, north of Redlands Boulevard which encompassed a small residential neighborhood, and stated that given the current traffic along Mt. View as well as future traffic and its proximity to the freeway, the Planning Commission recommended that the neighborhood ultimately be converted to commercial use that would allow reduction of driveways and provide for the alignment of a single intersection for the business park area on the east side of Mt. View. The intent was to have a willing buyer and willing seller and not "taking" the neighborhood.

He stated that testimony had previously been received to restore the Special Planning Area (SPA) Designations (SPA G and J) for the properties located on the east side of California Street and north of Barton Road. The SPA designations would restore developer's and property owner's ability to establish mixed-uses in the area. Those areas should be discussed as part of the Special Planning Areas due to possible conflicts of interest.

Director of Community Development Woldruff stated that there was concern about high density south of Barton Road, and the property owners were represented this evening.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, spoke, stating that an area south of Barton Road was put into the Hillside Area by Resolution 1744 with a density of point 1 to two units per acre and was re-zoned partially under the first Initiative as one unit per 10 acres or one unit per 5 acres if clustered, and would retain that designation until a new designation was given. It was his opinion that a new land use designation had not been given; however, a density of four units per acre was not provided, which was being requested at this time. The property contained a prominent hill that was higher than all the ridgelines along Lawton Avenue and had areas steeper than those included in the Hillside designation. He suggested it remain within the Hillside designation.

He went on to say that it was his opinion that much lower densities were needed throughout and that low density should align with what had been built in the City in the past, such as the areas of Lane and State Street. The new General Plan contained no regulations regarding open space for Planned Development.

Michael Stewart, 25810 Kellogg Street, commented that the City has spent a large sum of money on consultants who specialized in General Plans; workshops had been held over the past four years, and it was time to adopt a General Plan which was forward looking and not reactive. Any project proposed under the General Plan required hearings and community input prior to approval.

In response to questions concerning his property to the south of the Civic Center, he responded that high density did not necessarily generate more traffic if located close to centers and resources, such as shopping, library, senior center because it could be a walkable community. High density could be designed with open space. It was more desirable to live in the center of the City because of the conveniences available.

Ted Miller, 24200-24208 Barton Road, spoke regarding his property as well as properties in the vicinity currently designated as high density, and suggested it remain high density because of the uses in the area. If density were limited, it may stifle opportunities to upgrade the area. He went on to state that the property was within walking distance of the University and Medical Center without having to cross Barton Road.

In response to questions, Director of Community Development Woldruff stated that Medium High Density of 9-13 units per acre may be more appropriate, as it would encourage consolidation of properties in order to eliminate driveway access off of Barton Road within that limited area. She elaborated that a proposed policy to address the subject area states, "Conversion of existing single-family uses to multi-family development within the high density residential area located along the north side of Barton Road at Loma Linda's western City Limits shall be contingent upon preparation of a plan for consolidation of existing driveways prior to approval of multi-family development. Project sponsors of multi-family development shall demonstrate that access for proposed multi-family uses will be provided in a safe and efficient manner and there is sufficient agreement among property owners to implement such a plan."

James Kilian, 25271 Barton Road, representing Progressive Health Care which manages Heritage Gardens, stated that he was in the process of proposing a 40-unit apartment complex on 3.4 acres to the west of Heritage Gardens. The project was originally submitted for 60 units and was amended to 40 units, which was in compliance with the R-3 Multi-family residential zoning. Density complied with the current General Plan. The partnership at Heritage Gardens owned the property since 1963; approval was received in 1990 for a town home development that was the same density as the proposed apartments. Of the 133 employees, 43 live in Loma Linda. The partnership proposed apartments to provide needed housing in the community and a complex that it could continue to own.

Councilman Umeda indicated that when he was a Planning Commissioner, he declared a conflict of interest because of his proximity to the proposed development, and asked if that would preclude him from hearing the General Plan issues regarding the subject property.

City Attorney Holdaway responded that as to the General Plan and the entire vicinity, it would not be a conflict because of the public general exception. However, if the project came forward as an entitlement, then a conflict may exist. He also recommended that the discussion be kept at the General Plan level and not project specific.

Director of Community Development Woldruff, in response to questions indicated that the Planning Commission continued the project to allow the applicant an opportunity to work with the neighbors to address their concerns, and was scheduled for the Planning Commission meeting of June 14.

Mayor Petersen asked for any additional comments relating to the subject portion of the Land Use Element of the General Plan. No others came forward and this portion of the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Zola summarized that three properties were discussed as it related to high density residential. He recommended that the area along the north side of Barton Road at the west City Limits be left high density, which was its existing General Plan designation and would provide for the greatest range of opportunities.

He recommended that the property on the south side of Barton Road, west of Heritage Gardens, be shown as Medium High Density with a maximum of 13 units per acres, consistent with the property to the south as well as its current designation. The style of development would require project specific review.

For the property south of the Civic Center, based on prior discussion and looking at land use to the south and to the east, the appropriate density would be Medium Density, which was the current designation of 5.1 to 9 units per acre. Director of Community Development Woldruff clarified that the density was raised to High Density during the workshops because it was felt that if a senior development were to occur, a walkable community at a higher density would be appropriate.

Councilman Umeda asked if language could be placed in the General Plan to encourage home ownership in order to create a stable population and neighborhoods versus rental properties. Mrs. Woldruff responded that Loma Linda could not be compared with other cities because it is a small city with a large university and so the housing needs were different from those of other cities. Multi-family development was needed to accommodate students and those who could not afford home ownership. Redevelopment programs offered opportunities for apartment dwellers to become homeowners. Also, adopted policies ensured that multi-family developments were integrated into the neighborhood so as to create a positive influence.

Councilman Christman suggested that the recommendations of Mr. Zola be approved and that the area in the southern portion of the City near the Hillside designation be deferred to the discussion of the Hillside area. Councilman Umeda asked that slope information for the area be provided.

Mayor pro tempore Brauer concurred with the exception of the area north of Barton Road at the western edge of the City, and suggested that it be designated Medium High Density, based on existing uses. Councilman Umeda concurred.

Discussion ensued relating to the City's center, the area of Barton Road and Mountain View; whether residential was appropriate for the area south of the Civic Center and what uses were appropriate for the area east of the Civic Center.

Mr. Zola stated that as part of the Special Planning Areas, a City Center Special Planning Area focused on the intersection of Barton Road and Mt. View Avenue would be appropriate. The concept of having residential use on the property south of the Civic Center was to maintain the commercial traffic and commercial office access on Barton Road and to the north and to preclude non-residential traffic from extending on Mt. View Avenue south of Barton Road. Higher densities were recommended as part of the mixed use concept, with focus on the intersection, the intent being to maintain only residential access on Mt. View Avenue south of Barton Road. He also stated that the parcel just south of the Civic Center could be included in the special planning area encompassing property east of Mt. View Avenue and south of Barton Road.

In response to questions, Mr. Zola suggested that Special Planning Area "I" be expanded to include the Civic Center and the property to the south of the Civic Center, so that discussion could include expectations as to residential density and restriction of non-residential access. Councilmen Ziprick and Brauer concurred.

Discussion ensued pertaining to conflicts of interest related to the expanded Area "I." Mr. Zola suggested that rather than include the subject area in a special planning area, that a designation be considered for the parcel to the south of the Civic Center to include the Civic Center that would make both parcels part of a City Center and integrate them with a mixed use development that would be occurring to the north. It would then be a separate recommendation from Area "I."

Considering each area individually there was:

Consensus that the area on the north side of Barton Road at the west City Limits be designated Medium High Density; the area west of Heritage Gardens, south of Barton Road, Medium High Density, 9.1-13 units per acre.

Councilman Brauer expressed concern about the designation of Mixed Use for the area south of the Civic Center; however, he supported the consultant's recommendation that the area be designated for mixed uses for further focus and study.

Mr. Zola suggested that as part of the implementation portion of the General Plan, that the zoning ordinance address developing standards for amenities in the residential areas.

The City Council recessed at 8:07 p.m. and reconvened at 8:16 p.m. with all members present.

The public hearing relating to the area north of Mission Road and east of California Street was opened. Councilman Christman suggested that the entire area be designated for mixed use, that the frontage of Barton Road and possibly the frontage of California Street be designated Commercial; and that the interior of the area be designated other than Business Park.

Community Development Director Woldruff suggested that Planning Areas J and G be continued and noted that the Planning Commission recommended that those areas be taken out of the Special Planning Areas and replaced with standard land use designations, such as Office Park and Business Park; the block bounded by California Street, Barton Road, Orange, and New Jersey be mixed use with Commercial at the corner of Barton and California; the majority of the block running perpendicular northwest to southeast (the corner of Barton Road and Orange) as Multi-Family High Density; the northeast portion of the block as Office. She stated that Councilman Christman's suggestion was Staff's recommendation that the Special Planning Areas be restored, but with safeguards being placed into the General Plan Policies to preclude the areas from becoming completely residential by preserving a percentage of the corridors for commercial uses. She added that the economic feasibility studies and fiscal analysis didn't support California Street as a commercial corridor.

Terry Smith, 18627 Brookhurst Street, Fountain Valley, addressed Special Planning Area G, stating that it consisted of approximately 49 acres, 20 percent of which was commercial at the corner of Barton Road and California; 45 percent that was already high density apartments; 16 percent existing church; 13 percent was future medical at Barton and New Jersey; which left 6 percent that was his project of 2.7 acres that has been designated as a future study area for the Mission District. The designation in the area of Orange Street extending from the City of Redlands was Medium to High Density Residential. Area J, which was across the street and in the County area, was zoned 13-17 units per acre. The corner of California and Orange Street had five times the traffic and the corner at Barton and New Jersey would have 13 times the traffic that his project would generate. Both of those corners had a Residential designation. Their project as proposed would generate one-third the amount of traffic that an office building in that location would generate.

Ruthann Lehrer, 2730 Washington Avenue, Santa Monica, worked with Roger Peter Porter for his proposed project at Orange Street and New Jersey; and specialized in historical preservation. Impacts on historical resources were reviewed in the planning process for Mr. Porter's development, which was the only area that was unresolved in Planning Area G. The area originally had a High Density Residential Use designation in the General Plan Update, which also considered potential hospitality uses. The uses permitted in the Mission Historical District Overlay included those consistent with a Mixed Use General Plan Land Use designation and Planned Community Zoning. A commercial use for their subject site was not economically viable. She stated that their proposed project would be an ownership single-family housing project of 30 units in contrast to the high-density apartment project nearby. New Jersey Street was a neighborhood-serving street that didn't carry major traffic; however, further to the north on New Jersey Street at Redlands Boulevard, there was a business park with commercial uses. She supported Staff's recommendation that the area be designated as a Special Planning Area.

Roger Peter Porter, 3837 E. 7th Street, Long Beach, stated that he was the co-owner and co-developer with Terry Smith of the 2.7 acres at the southwest corner of New Jersey and Orange Street; that the proposal was supported by Staff; that the Historical Commission did not support their proposal because of the site plan, expressed concern about density and setbacks, and requested a special study for historical resources, which was provided and which showed that there were no historical resources on the site. He indicated he was willing to revisit the site plan and work with interested parties, but supported residential zoning because the subject area was surrounded by residential uses. The site did not have location or exposure for a commercial development; however a study was done that indicated 50,000 square feet of two-story office building and the parking of 160 cars.

John Shumway of the Concord Group, 130 Newport Center Drive, Newport Beach, also addressed the 2.7 acre-site, stating that office use required a central place, visibility with compatible surrounding land uses, and close proximity to major traffic corridors. In his opinion, the parcel in Area G should not be designated as "office."

John Mirau, 1806 Orange Tree Lane, Redlands; spoke to Area J and G in terms of the viability of commercial use. He stated that Fairfield submitted a letter indicating that they were willing to develop a true mixed-use development. With respect to Area D, which encompassed University Village and Orchard Park Projects, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the specific plans; however, the plans were not consistent with the proposed General Plan Update regarding many issues. He expressed a willingness to work with Staff regarding the specific plans so that they were compatible with

the General Plan. Speaking to Area H, there were similar restrictions and he indicated that the landowners would be requesting modifications similar to those presented for Areas J and G.

Hugo Chinchay, 26382 Antonio Circle, spoke on behalf of the Loma Linda Spanish and Filipino Churches, relating to Areas G and J, stating that those areas directly affected the churches. The congregations supported Mixed Use designation and not commercial or office use around the churches.

Milford Harrison, representing Robert Bell, owner of the property at the southeast corner of Citrus and California, which was in the County area with a land use General Plan and Zoning designation of Residential at 14 units per acre, indicated that no project had been filed; however, Mr. Bell requested the opportunity to maintain flexibility as to a designated use in that he was not ready to develop the property, but was concerned that a designation of "Office" may be condemnation or a taking, based on recent studies. He also stated that a mixed-use designation required guidelines so that the area was developed as a true mixed use and not all residential. He also stated that as mixed-use bordered major intersections such as Barton Road and California Street and California Street and Redlands Boulevard, the percentage of land required for commercial should be increased and the percentage reduced for those areas more remote from the major corridors. He also indicated that Jeff Goldfarb, an attorney for Mr. Bell, also had concerns about the environmental review. He then presented a letter for inclusion in the record.

Paul Hsu, 20151 Sealpoint Lane, Huntington Beach, stated that he owned properties in Area J and G in the Sphere of Influence and requested that the old mixed-use language or the new language relating to specific plan be reinstated. He then asked Ed McCoy, to address the technical issues.

Mr. McCoy represented Fairfield Residential, 5510 Morehouse Drive, San Diego, and stated that Fairfield and Mr. Bell were the largest landowners in Area J, an area that was currently designated 14 units per acre by the County. Considering the area for Business Park was not feasible because the area currently had an approved apartment project, an existing church as well as a planned church and was across from California Street on which there was planned at least 1,000 units. In his opinion, the area had been compromised for any type of biotech or high-tech or business park use because of the interceptors in the area. Residential use, because of the surrounding land use, would be appropriate for Area J. He indicated that Fairfield was committed to developing a mixed-use project and proposed a 9-13 dwelling unit per acre project. The local streets should be utilized to support residential communities with support retail. He supported designating Area J as Mixed Use, and indicated that he would be willing to incorporate orange trees in the plan to preserve the historic or nostalgic approach to the property.

Michael Christianson, 25241 Cottage Street, and a Planning Commissioner, concurred with the suggestion of increasing the percentage of commercial uses in the areas of major intersections and reducing the percentage for the interior portions of the area.

Jonathan Zirkle, 25247 Barton Road, stated that John Husing, an expert in economics, sensed that growth in the area was due to population pressures from Orange County and other areas west of Loma Linda, which served the commuter. He then referred to Page 5-29 of the proposed General Plan, which indicated that within the mixed use areas, 60 percent of the housing density would be very low income; 30 percent low income; and 10 percent moderate income, and questioned the application of that table. He also indicated that depending upon the type of commercial use; traffic may not be a concern. He also stated that in his opinion, a density of four units per acre was fair to attract the type of resident which would in turn attract the type of business and therefore the type of community desired. He also stated that: the General Plan Elements were not compatible with each other; the General Plan should go to a vote of the people; the General Plan should not be approved in its current form; he would be involved in putting an initiative before the voters if the General Plan was adopted in its current format with the development allowed. He also asked that the Planning Commission meetings be televised.

An extensive discussion ensued between Council Members and Mr. Zirkle.

[Councilman Christman left at 10:08 p.m.]

Leland Lubinsky, 24818 Redlands Boulevard, suggested that Loma Linda be compared to Evanston, Illinois where there was a large university that owned much of the land and "sucked up" most of the city services and until recently refused to give anything in lieu of taxes. There had been no open discussion as to the role the University should play in the development of the city; and no independent study that indicated that commercial/retail should be a goal of the City Council. He questioned whether small commercial provided sufficient revenue to the City to offset the services required and suggested that high-density apartments in the area of the University would attract those employed in the City. He indicated that the General Plan should avoid deterioration of the community; address the negative effect of urban sprawl; provide a method to address increased population and high density around the city center; retain some of the old atmosphere; and understand the city is small and dominated by a large non-profit institution. He also stated that the floodway was not adequately addressed in the General Plan.

[Councilman Christman returned at 10:29 p.m.]

Hugo Chinchay, 26382 Antonio Circle, indicated that comments made concerning low income could be construed as being discriminatory; that his comments presented earlier represented a poll of approximately 1,500 people; that those opposing high density should voice their concerns at a public hearing.

Glenn Elssmann, 25814 Business Center Drive, expressed concern that representations and statements made were exaggerated, distorted and enflamed inaccurate perceptions. He stated that a majority of the vacant land had approved plans or specific plans. The developments proposed by private property owners as well as the University would not reach an added population of 13,000, and build-out would not reach 69,000-89,000 as previously stated. Providing services, water, addressing traffic was required by law. The Inland Empire was one of the areas in the entire State of California that was water rich. The General Plan was a plan for the next 20 + years and providing housing for all income categories of its citizens was a responsibility of the City Council.

Robert Stewart, 11695 Largo Court, stated that the Stewart family owned the property south of the Civic Center which was designated High Density and which would provide for clustering of houses at varying heights as well as open space. Development of the area was proposed for a senior campus environment with various levels of housing for various needs of the community. The General Plan should provide the vision for the future to allow people to stay in the community and not leave due to lack of housing.

The public hearing was closed. The City Council recessed at 10:40 p.m. and reconvened at 10:43 p.m. with all members present.

Mr. Zola stated that the General Plan addressed the effect of the University, housing needs and traffic. Representatives of the University attended the General Plan meetings and commented on the General Plan's effect on LLU. He elaborated that the General Plan must be integrated. Upon completion of discussion of the various Elements of the General Plan, the points of discussion would be integrated into a draft final document and presented to the City Council for review and final action.

He elaborated that comments were made concerning the Bi-County Corridor, and it was the decision of the City Council early in the discussions that the Bi-County Corridor was not to be part of the General Plan; and that the Circulation Element would not include a Bi-County corridor.

Relating to population, he stated that SCAG was projecting a lower population for Loma Linda, as if it would become a retirement community.

Councilman Umeda asked Mr. Zola to incorporate language into Areas G & J (along California Street at Redlands Boulevard and Barton Road) that required certain portions of each project or specific plan to incorporate commercial aspects; to increase the percentage of commercial use in the areas of a major corridor or intersection, and to submit to City Council for review. Councilman Christman concurred.

Discussion ensued concerning the 2.7 acres in Area J proposed for a residential project by Roger Peter Porter. The City Council asked the consultant to show how it would be integrated into Area J as to mixed use.

Councilman Brauer indicated that he would like to see some element of a business park in the area of California Street.

In response to comments concerning the inconsistency of the University Village and Orchard Park specific plans to the General Plan, Mr. Zola stated that the specific plans and the text in the General Plan for the area would be reviewed during the public hearing process.

Mr. Zola stated that in the special planning areas, density was described, but build out numbers were not identified. He then suggested that as each planning area was discussed, it would be helpful to describe the number of units permitted within each planning area.

He noted that low density was identified as five units per acre; current low density was designated as four units per acre.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

Approved at the meeting of